Attachment 2

Proposal Evaluation
and
Proposal Preparation Instructions

B539728

July 13, 2004

Contents

1 PROPOSAL EVALUATION AND SELECTION 3

1.1 Evaluation Criteria 3
1.2 Requirement Definitions 3
1.3 Basis for Selection 3
1.4 Evaluation Factors 4
1.4.1 Technical Proposal 4
1.4.2 Feasibility and Schedule Credibility 4
1.4.3 Supplier Attributes 4
1.4.4 Affordability 5

2 PROPOSAL CONTENTS 5

2.1 General 5
2.2 Mandatory Requirements 5
2.3 Nonmandatory Requirements and Supplier Attributes 5
2.3.1 Performance Features 5
2.3.2 Supplier Attributes 5
2.3.3 Acceptance of Work into OpenIB 6
2.4 Small Business Subcontracting Plan 6
2.5 Representations and Certifications Form ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
2.6 DUNS Number 6
2.7 Acceptance of Terms & Conditions 6
2.8 Price and Delivery Schedule 6
2.9 Overview of Software 6
2.10 Current Status 7
2.11 Project Management 7
2.12 Product Development Plan/Roadmap, Milestones and Testing 7
2.12.1 Product Roadmap and Milestones 7
2.12.2 Product Testing 8

1 Proposal Evaluation and Selection

1.1 Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation criteria are performance features (the combination of mandatory requirements, target requirements and Offeror proposed features), delivery schedule, feasibility, supplier attributes, and affordability that the University will use to evaluate proposals. (Care should be taken not to confuse use of the word "performance" with performance measurement requirements for the software product requested by the RFP.) The University's assessment of each proposal's evaluation criteria will form the basis for selection.

1.2 Requirement Definitions

Particular paragraphs of the Statement of Work have the following priority designations.

(a) Mandatory requirements are designated as (MR). Mandatory requirements are items that are essential to the University and reflect the minimum qualifications an Offeror must meet in order to have their proposal evaluated further for selection.

(b) Target Requirements are designated as (TR-1, TR-2 and TR-3). Each requirement so labeled deals with features, components, performance characteristics or other properties that is considered a part of the OpenIB software stack, but will not be a determining factor of response compliance. Target requirements are prioritized with a dash number with TR-1 being the most important. Taken together, the aggregate of the MR, and TR-1 requirements form a baseline OpenIB software stack. TR-1 targets are as important to the program as mandatory requirements, but not meeting any particular TR-1 target requirement is insufficient to render a proposal as non-responsive. TR-2 targets are second priority after TR-1 requirements. TR-2 requirements are considered goals that boost a minimal OpenIB software stack, when offered as an aggregate of MR, TR-1 and TR-2 requirements, into the moderately useful category. TR-3 targets are third priority after TR-2 requirements. TR-3 requirements are considered stretch goals that boost a moderately useful system, taken together as an aggregate of MR, TR-1, TR-2 and TR-3 requirements, into the highly useful category. Thus, the ideal OpenIB software stack will meet or exceed all MR, TR-1, TR-2 and TR-3 requirements. Target Requirement responses will be considered as part of the evaluation of Technical Proposal Excellence (see Attachment 2, Proposal Evaluation and Proposal Preparation Instructions).

1.3 Basis for Selection

The University intends to select the Offeror whose proposal satisfies the mandatory requirements and contains the combination of affordability, delivery, nonmandatory evaluation criteria (target requirements and Offeror proposed features), and supplier attributes offering the best overall value to the University. The University will determine the best overall value by comparing differences in nonmandatory evaluation criteria, delivery, and supplier attributes offered with differences in price, striking the most advantageous balance between expected performance and the overall price to the University. Offerors must, therefore, be persuasive in describing the value of their proposed nonmandatory evaluation features and supplier attributes in enhancing the likelihood of successful performance or otherwise best achieving the University's objectives. The University may select the Offeror whose proposal is

considered to offer the best overall value compared to proposals with either higher or lower prices. The University's selection may be made on the basis of the initial proposals or the University may elect to negotiate with any or all Offerors.

1.4 Evaluation Factors

The University will evaluate the proposal for performance features, delivery schedule, feasibility, supplier attributes and affordability.

1.4.1 Technical Proposal

A production OpenIB stack is sought with HPC capabilities, whose development is based on a unified 'best of breed' approach from the various open source InfiniBand stacks. An implementation strategy must be developed through an evaluation of the current InfiniBand stacks. The evaluation will include stack architecture, performance, scalability, portability, vendor neutrality, build environment, and extensibility. This evaluation process should result in an implementation plan whitepaper for a production unified OpenIB stack. The implementation plan should include OpenIB stack release candidates, at least, every six months. The OpenIB release candidate should be qualified and tested, through a rigorous regression testing suite, as a production stack. An evaluation will be conducted on the six-month release candidate stacks to ensure that the development is meeting the Statement of Work requirements.

Proposals will be evaluated on a section-by-section, point-by-point basis in accordance with the technical requirements contained in the Draft Statement of Work.

1.4.2 Feasibility and Schedule Credibility

The proposal should demonstrate the likelihood that the Offeror's software will work as proposed and how well the technical approach aligns with the Offeror's product roadmap.

The University will assess the likelihood that the proposed delivery will be achieved. The following topics could be used to demonstrate schedule credibility.

- The quality and scope of the development plan
- The quality and scope of the project management plan
- The quality and scope of the product test plan
- The quality, scope and technical content of the milestone schedule

1.4.3 Supplier Attributes

The University will assess the Offeror's experience and past performance in providing similar software solutions.

- The quality and scope of the Offeror's performance record for InfiniBand
- The Offeror's affiliation to OpenIB
- The Offeror's demonstrated ability to meet schedule and delivery promises
- The Offeror's ability to comply with the required or proposed delivery and performance schedules
- The existence of adequate financial resources to perform the Subcontract
- The Offeror's experience and past performance in providing Open Source solutions

- The Offeror's experience and past performance in providing high performance computing (HPC) solutions
- The individual proposed as the project manager and the level of project management authority delegated by the corporation to that individual

1.4.4 Affordability

The University will assess the affordability of the proposal as follows.

- Reasonableness of the total proposed price compared to other proposals
- The proposed price compared to the University's perceived value

2 Proposal Contents

2.1 General

In the Technical Proposal, the Offeror shall describe its approach for completing the work and delivering the required software. This shall be written in the form of an integrated narrative **and shall include a section-by-section, point-by-point (numbered) response to the technical requirements contained in the Draft Statement of Work**. **Requirements that are not offered in the Offeror's proposal shall be numbered and marked as "not offered" in the section-by-section, line-by-line response.**

2.2 Mandatory Requirements

The Offeror's proposal shall discuss and demonstrate its ability to meet or exceed each of the mandatory requirements identified in the Draft Statement of Work.

2.3 Nonmandatory Requirements and Supplier Attributes

The Offeror's proposal should identify and discuss any proposed requirements, other performance features, and supplier attributes that will be important to the Offeror's successful performance and the attainment of the University's objectives. The University has identified the performance features and supplier attributes listed below, which should be discussed in the proposal. The Offeror may identify and discuss other performance features and supplier attributes it believes may be of value to the University. If the University agrees, consideration may be given to them in the evaluation process. In all cases, the University will assess the value of each proposal as submitted.

2.3.1 Performance Features

The Offeror's proposal shall discuss and demonstrate its ability to meet or exceed each of the target requirements identified in the Draft Statement of Work or indicate that it is not proposing a target requirement.

In addition to the Mandatory Requirements, the Offeror may propose any Target Requirements or other features for the software, and any additional features consistent with the objectives of this project that the Offeror believes will be of benefit to the University. Target Requirements and additional features proposed by the successful Offeror may be included in the resulting Subcontract.

2.3.2 Supplier Attributes

See section 1.4.3 for a detailed list of supplier attributes. The Offeror shall provide a written description of projects similar in type and complexity as this project that the

Offeror has recently completed. These may include public and private contracts. Include technical and business contact points by name, title, address, telephone number and, if available, e-mail address. Offerors are encouraged to include a self-assessment of their performance on these projects including what went well and what did not. Offerors may discuss the latter in the context of a lessons learned scenario. The Offeror may also identify, and provide resumes for, key personnel who will perform the work.

2.3.3 Acceptance of Work into OpenIB

The Offeror shall provide a written description of how the proposed work will be integrated into OpenIB. This may include the Offeror's affiliation to OpenIB, maintainers for OpenIB modules, and a plan for working with the OpenIB community to bring the proposed work into the main OpenIB code branch.

2.4 Small Business Subcontracting Plan

Unless the Offeror is a small business, or the total value of the offer is less than $500,000, the successful Offeror must provide a Small Business Subcontracting Plan, which includes the anticipated total subcontracting amount and the percentage goals and amounts for all of the various small business categories. Refer to the *Small Business Subcontracting Plan* clause referenced in the GENERAL PROVISIONS and the RFP's Model Small Business Subcontracting Plan for additional information. The approved plan will be made a part of any resulting Subcontract. Failure to submit an acceptable subcontracting plan shall make the Offeror ineligible for award of a Subcontract.

2.5 DUNS Number and Financial Statements

The Offeror shall provide its D-U-N-S number as part of the proposal and may be requested to provide audited and certified financial statements (current balance sheet, income statement and other financial statements or reports) for the most recent completed fiscal year.

2.6 Acceptance of Terms & Conditions

Submission of a proposal shall indicate the Offeror's willingness to accept the terms and conditions of the sample Subcontract and its attachments unless specific exceptions are taken. These terms and conditions have been approved by the DOE/NNSA. Changing them may be time consuming. Failure to accept the terms and conditions may result in significant, unacceptable delays in award of a Subcontract which could cause the University to reject your proposal.

2.7 Price and Delivery Schedule

The proposal shall include a total firm fixed price for the work and a proposed milestone payment schedule. The University requires delivery of the software by 18 months after the contract award date. An alternate completion date may be proposed, which may be subject to negotiation prior to award.

2.8 Overview of Software

The Offeror shall provide a general overview of the end state of the OpenIB InfiniBand software stack, with HPC capabilities, proposed to meet the requirements contained in the Draft Statement of Work. In addition to the specific requirements in the Draft Statement of

Work, as part of the overview, the Offeror is invited to present any additional software features that may increase its overall value:

- For software impact, describe additional software that may utilize the proposed stack. Examples are Lustre, SRP, iSCSI, iSER, uDAPL, kDAPL, and IT-API upper layer protocols.
- For InfiniBand diagnostics and management tools, latency reduction, and scalable system software, and MPI middleware describe other tools that may increase the value of the software.
- Describe any additional platforms, compilers, operating systems, and InfiniBand hardware supported to increase availability of the software. The University has an interest in extensions to the following operating systems and architectures: P-series Linux and AIX for the Power, Linux PowerPC, and Linux for IA64.
- Describe any additional partners in the open source effort that may accelerate the addition of features to the software.
- Describe the Offeror's longer term productization or support strategy that contributes to the long term viability of the software.
- Describe any development activities of the Offeror that may be complimentary to the scope of the work. Note if these activities are included in the proposed price or if the cost will be borne by the Subcontractor.
- Describe the status of open source licenses and all relevant intellectual property rights that will result from this effort.

2.9 Current Status

In this section, the Offeror shall describe the current status of the software that they propose to leverage, develop, or enhance.

2.10 Project Management

If multiple organizations and/or independent contributors are to be involved in the project, give an overview of how the work will be managed and in particular how multiple organizations and/or independent contributors will be coordinated together and with OpenIB. In addition, if there are other models for open source project management that have worked well in the past, please include these suggestions as well. Describe how the source code will be managed. Describe opportunities for and expectations of collaboration with the University in the development project.

2.11 Product Development Plan/Roadmap, Milestones and Testing

2.11.1 Product Roadmap and Milestones

The product is to be deployed within 18 months of Subcontract award. Please describe the development plan/roadmap for this deployment, including project milestones and availability of early deployment alpha and beta products with partial functionality for testing by the University.

While the product requested is to be Open Source, it is important that this not be framed as a pure development effort. It must be coupled with a commercial entity capable of and committed to longer term support of the resulting technology. The proposal should include a specific productization strategy that ensures continuing support.

2.11.2 Product Testing

Describe the testing plan for the proposed software. In particular, what resources are available for testing on the officially supported platforms – and at what scale? What access to additional resources is required to do testing at higher parallel scale? When delivered, product functionality proposed is to be demonstrated by showing performance measurements on codes supplied by the University. These codes will be made available to the successful Offeror for testing purposes.